REMARKS

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

5

The specification was objected to for minor informalities concerning blanks of incomplete information. The specification has been amended to address the Examiner's objection. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objection.

10

35 U.S.C. 102(e) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,212 to Nakano et al. (hereinafter "Nakano"). Applicant respectfully
15   submits that Nakano fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "altering an attribute of a file, prior to said altering, the attribute being included in a prior set of attributes of the file stored in a memory device."
20   Independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "a work area including a file undergoing development, the file having a prior set of attributes and file contents; and a staging area for receiving an alteration made in the work area to an attribute of the prior set of attributes."

The Office Action states that Nakano teaches each and every limitation of claims 1-21.
25   Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Nakano discloses a system and method for website development including hierarchical file systems, referred to as "areas." Some of the hierarchical file systems are modifiable to enable the creation of the files that make up the content of a website. *See* col. 5, lines 51-
30   55.

Nakano fails to teach or suggest "altering an attribute of a file, prior to said altering, the attribute being included in a prior set of attributes of the file stored in a memory device," as claimed in independent claim 1. Nakano further fails to teach or suggest "a work area
35   including a file undergoing development, the file having a prior set of attributes and file

3

contents; and a staging area for receiving an alteration made in the work area to an attribute of the prior set of attributes," as claimed in independent claim 15.

At most, Nakano discloses that each hierarchical file system, such as a work area, a staging
5   area, or an edition area, has two unique identifiers, a "generation ID" and an "object ID." *See* col. 8, lines 11-14. The generation ID <u>uniquely identifies an area and indicates how an area is related to other areas</u>, while the object ID <u>identifies the object that represents the area</u> and is unchangeable. *See* col. 8, lines 14-30. Nowhere in Nakano is it taught or suggested alteration of <u>an attribute of a file</u>, the file having a prior set of attributes and file contents
10   stored in a memory device, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 15.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15 are distinguishable over Nakano. Claims 2-14 and 16-21, dependent directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 15, respectively, are also distinguishable over Nakano at least for the same
15   reasons as stated above.

4

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from
5   the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the
rejections and objections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of
Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to
issue as a United States patent.

10
                                        Respectfully Submitted,

15   Michael A. Glenn,
                                        Reg. No. 30,176

Customer number 22862.

5